

USING VOMIT GAS IN VIETNAM IS
ACTUALLY A HUMANE FORM OF
WARFARE

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] a moment ago suggesting the use of a gas which makes people nauseated represents an inhumane and barbarous type of warfare.

V N
Stratton

If the gentleman had taken the trouble to read the announcement of the Department of Defense he would have seen that in combat situations in Vietnam, where the Vietcong enemy has infiltrated with friendly South Vietnam civilians, rather than drop bombs that would kill all these people, friends and foes alike, we are now utilizing a discovery which simply makes them nauseated and for the time being prevents the Vietcong enemy from attacking our friends, thereby saving their lives. I cannot think of a more humane development that we could possibly use. Instead of criticizing the Pentagon I think we ought to congratulate those chemists who have come up with this new and humane method of fighting this difficult and baffling guerrilla war which has so often frustrated our capabilities in more conventional types of weapons. Let us hope our scientists continue to perfect similar developments which will prevent the Communists from destroying the freedom of South Vietnam with a minimum of loss of life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making. Everyone knows our country is doing all that it possibly can to suppress the spread of Communist infiltration. We are up against a conspiracy. The President has briefed the Members of Congress. He is the Commander in Chief. Our commanders in the field are reasonable people who are trying to do a reasonable job under difficult circumstances, and I think it ill behooves us to map military strategy here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman. We ought to make clear that what is being used in Vietnam is not a poison gas of the type considered by the Geneva Convention, but a humane gas, a new and encouraging development. Let us not be frightened with labels. Let us recognize the facts.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are not any two ways about it, we must protect our troops from infiltration. This Congress has gone on record unequivocally as supporting the President of the United States in his effort to bring peace in Vietnam. We are doing everything we possibly can to get the point home to these people that we will not be driven out of Vietnam. This use of a new gas is one of the human ways we are now trying to bring sense into the heads of these people. If this does not work we might try something else. But we are determined to stay there, and this Congress and the Nation are backing the President in his course. We must win. We cannot be defeated, and we will not retreat. It is a question of whose side you are on. I happen to be on the side of the President of the United States and the American people. It is as simple as that.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for the position he has taken in this matter. I would like to support the position of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], and the gentleman from South Carolina who chairs the all-important Armed Services Committee here in the House of Representatives and express once again my whole-hearted support for the President in Vietnam and his leadership there against the aggressiveness of communism.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I want to join my able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. Rivers] and the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], in supporting the President of the United States in the military policy laid down in South Vietnam. To me it would be incredible if we do not use all of the means at our command to support our Armed Forces in South Vietnam who are the victims of the vicious aggression of the Communists. So far as the use of this gas is concerned, it is not a gas in the ordinary sense at all. It is the humane way or instrument of making war. Should we pull out of there, may I say to the gentleman, that would then be the road to war, and to untold hardship over all of southeast Asia, if not indeed over the entire world. It is the course of peace that we are pursuing in South Vietnam today.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Would the gentleman from New York agree with me that the use of this particular instrumentality is within the discretion of field commanders?

Mr. STRATTON. I do not know what the rules and regulations are that the Pentagon has adopted on this new weapon, and I would not want to comment on that particular point. I feel sure that a decision has been made at the highest level. But to suggest, as was done a moment ago on this floor, that the use of a gas which merely makes people vomit and temporarily incapacitates them, rather than killing them, is some sort of barbaric and inhumane procedure—when in point of fact this weapon was developed and is now being used to save lives rather than take lives and is therefore a new kind of humane weapon—is just fantastic and I could not let this opportunity pass without taking the time to comment on it here on the floor of this House.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the

permanent House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, March 22, to show on rollcall No. 43 I was present and did vote "yea," for I was present and did vote "yea," and this was not properly recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUEST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday and Thursday of next week, March 30 and April 1, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 60 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the time allotted to me for today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RETURN PRAYER TO THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

(Mr. WATKINS (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I have fulfilled a promise that I pledged to the voters of the Seventh District of Pennsylvania during the recent campaign. This promise of action brought great response from the various groups and formal gatherings, that I had the pleasure of addressing during the campaign.

The voters of the Seventh District would like prayers returned to the public schools of the Nation. I have introduced a measure to restore prayer to the schools, as I feel their request must be met.

Today, many questions concerning the social fabric of our Nation are being asked of the Nation's leaders. The students are daily asking questions concerning morality and social progress. Yet, a factor in the development of the American character has been removed from the classrooms. Prayer remains an important function in every state occasion, both on the local and national levels. As Members of Congress, we welcome a prayer each day. However, prayers are not found in the places of learning, where the future Members of this great body will be found. Prayer is the highest form of respect and honor and I feel that respect is missing from the current social fabric of our Nation.

The State should remain neutral in the matters of religion, however real neutrality would best be served, if the State would permit those children who so desire to begin their school day with a prayer to do so. My bill mentions prayer, not religion or a specific prayer. I am calling for a free exercise of principles through prayer. Principles and ideas must be expressed and prayer is certainly an effective method of placing personal conflicts aside and having the individual ponder his role in life.

The highest Court of the land must always intercede to prevent infringements upon freedom of religion, however the Court should guard against decisions which would identify the Federal Government with antireligion. The intent of the Founding Fathers was that this Nation will have freedom of religion—not freedom from religion.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION SPEAKS OUT ON MERGER

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as one who has for many years been interested in military affairs, having served both as a National Guard officer and as a Reserve officer, I am very much interested in Secretary McNamara's proposed merger of the Reserves and the Guard.

I am concerned now that in the long run, our National Security may be impaired, rather than enhanced, by his proposal. The Reserve Officers Association has recently written a letter to the Governor of Massachusetts, in which they alert him to some of the details of Secretary McNamara's plan which, in their opinion, will adversely affect the Guard in Massachusetts.

As the time for hearings on this question approaches, I feel that this letter may be helpful to my colleagues in understanding the long-range results of the proposed merger, and I therefore, under unanimous consent, have it reprinted in the RECORD.

There are, in addition to the points made by the ROA, other effects of Secretary McNamara's proposal that, it now appears, affect our Nation's long-range ability to respond in a military way to the rising threat of armed conflict.

In the absence of more specific arguments to the contrary, I believe that our Nation needs a strong Reserve, as well as a strong National Guard. Their resources and their roles are so significant and so different, that we should continue them in substantially their present form.

The letter follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1965.
Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: The Secretary of the Army held a press conference March 15 and announced that 37 Governors of the States plus the District of Columbia had approved the troop list changes inherent in the proposal to destroy the Army Reserve, increase the strength of the National Guard, and place the remnants of the Army Reserve into a pool of personnel who will be subject to recall

but will be unable to train other than by taking correspondence courses.

I realize that the only official communications that you have had on the subject is through your adjutant general who has been subjected to tremendous pressure from both the Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau to accept the plan and the concept. The National Guard Association has exerted similar pressure upon him and has urged him to put the plan to you in its best light. Some of the adjutant generals have resisted the pressure and some of them have not.

The pressure stemming from the National Guard leadership is premised solely upon an overall increase in National Guard numbers and exclusive control of the Army Reserve by the National Guard.

But this is not the whole story and as Governor of your State, with responsibility for its welfare and that of its citizens, I ask you to listen to the other side which this letter endeavors to tell you.

While it is true that the National Guard overall strength is being increased from 400,000 to 550,000 men, this accession of numbers is being purchased at a tragic price.

The National Guard, today, with an authorized allowance of 400,000 officers and men is organized into 23 divisions. Fifteen of these divisions will be abolished. In other words, 66 percent of the National Guard organization as it exists today will be eliminated. About 150,000 National Guardsmen will be summarily dismissed from their positions. Out of these 15 divisions, 6 small brigades will be formed. Forty general officers, now in the National Guard, will lose their drilling status. The impact of this will be felt heavily by every National Guard organization located west of the Mississippi.

Furthermore, after the reorganization is completed and the National Guard becomes the only Reserve Force left to the Army, it will inevitably lose its State orientation and control. The Secretary of Defense believes, with the intensity of a crusader, in a completely centralized organization and simply will not tolerate State interference. When questioned by the Senate Preparedness Committee on this subject on March 1, he stated and I quote his exact words, "because I have directed it and because the Federal Government pays 90 percent of its costs and consequently holds a heavy bludgeon over them." The handwriting is on the wall. If this reorganization goes through, your control over your National Guard forces will be nominal.

There is another aspect to this reorganization that should be brought to your attention. The reservists in your State far outnumber the National Guardsmen. They are citizens, too. They bitterly resent being torn out of the Army Reserve and having their Reserve component destroyed and turned into a pool. They are looking to you for all of the protection that you can give them. They expect it of you.

In the light of the damage this plan will do to the National Guardsmen and Reserves in your State; the turbulence and poor morale it will cause; the net reduction of income to your citizens who have been doing their duty and do not deserve this blow; and the necessity for supporting the status of the National Guard as a State militia, we urge you to vigorously oppose this concept.

As one of the distinguished Senators in the Senate Preparedness Committee stated, "This is no time to reduce our military strength simply to save money." It is now generally acknowledged that the primary purpose of the plan was conceived to do just that.

E. H. REEDER,
Rear Admiral, USNR,
National President.

FIVE PERSPECTIVES ON EAST-WEST TRADE

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1965, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of East-West trade.

Dr. Dobriansky is a distinguished economist. He is also internationally recognized as a legitimate authority on conditions within the Communist empire.

It is my understanding that there may be considerable delay before the committee in the other body completes its hearings on the subject of trade with Communist governments.

It is also my understanding that the House committees expect to give this vital issue only superfluous attention.

Therefore, I deem it necessary and timely to make Dr. Dobriansky's views available for review at this time.

Before doing so, I include at this point a statement by the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who, as a Senator from Minnesota, observed the following in a 1961 address:

The Soviet Union's economic offensive is a carefully thought out plan to disrupt normal commercial cooperation between the industrial nations of the West and the underdeveloped countries which need capital, to snare other nations into becoming economically dependent on the Soviet Union, and to promote friction within the Western alliance. What we are seeing is a form of economic banditry by the Soviet Union, another weapon in its imperialistic scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the statement entitled "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," by Dr. Dobriansky:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members, I am grateful for this opportunity to present five interrelated perspectives on the extremely vital subject of East-West trade. With some identifying qualification, the quoted Humphrey statement on the cover describes pungently the nature of the totalitarian Red economic aggression launched against us and the free world. Considering the effectiveness of Moscow's deceptive peaceful coexistence and the potemkinized independence of so-called satellites in central Europe, the statement bears even greater applicability today than 4 years ago.

Within the limited space of this presentation, the perspectives offered here embrace certain supportable preconceptions and points of understanding that necessarily must impinge on any rational evaluation of the issue. Indeed, whatever the preconceptions, analytically they are more determinative for the resolution of this important issue than the essentially secondary considerations of credits, strategicity of goods, outstanding obligations, various legal impediments, patents, copyrights, the most-favored-nation treatment and, last but not least, the blunt desire for profits. Narrow discussions of these secondary points cannot satisfactorily answer the more fundamental questions of the strategic significance of trade in the imperio-colonialist Red design for world conquest, the role of the so-called satellites in the implementation of this design, Western economic contributions to the

March 23, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5513

Second. It would save the treasuries in the 50 States millions of dollars in unnecessary election costs.

Third. It would make it possible for a Member to devote himself completely and entirely to his duties instead of having to campaign all of the time.

Fourth. It would go far toward reducing pressures of the many pressure groups.

Fifth. I am told that a fairly recent poll conducted throughout the United States showed that the vast majority of our voters favor a 4-year term.

Mr. Speaker, before I introduced this legislation, I wrote a letter to 432 Members of the House asking them to please give me their advice as to whether I should undertake the task. As a result, I was glad to learn that out of 236 replies, 170 were unequivocally for the amendment, 20 were against it, and 46 listed themselves in the doubtful column. Many of the 170 had written in longhand such notes as: "I am fervently for it," "overwhelmingly," "vehemently," and "emphatically" for it. One Member even used the expression that he was not only religiously and painstakingly for the legislation but that his wife was, too.

Mr. Speaker, if you and my colleagues will please pardon a personal reference, let me give to you what my daughter, Bonnie, said to me on one of my trips home from Washington. Upon my arrival at my home in Lebanon, I was greeted by the family and my then little daughter, Bonnie, said: "How long are you going to be home on this trip?" When I replied that we were in recess and therefore I could spend a few days, she lowered her head and sadly replied: "But daddy, when you are home, you are never home." She was right—I was leaving immediately for a speaking engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my House Joint Resolution 394, is not a new idea. Bills of this nature have been introduced for years. However, in making a conscientious and diligent study of all of the bills I was able to secure, I found that they did not adequately cover the situation. As a result, I have tried desperately to use as much of the language and expressions which would carry out the original intent and purpose of our intellectual Founding Fathers when they conceived, drafted, and perfected our great Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of the shopworn arguments against this legislation, the chief objection being the House

their Government, but there is no problem whatsoever with the Members keeping in close touch with the people. When the term of 2 years was set in the Constitutional Conventions, it was done for the purpose of allowing each House Member to go back home, most generally by horseback or carriage, to visit his approximately 30,000 constituents. Today, my colleagues, the situation is quite different with radio, newspapers, magazines, telephone, telegraph, TV, and now even with the satellite Telestar, we can bounce messages live when and as they are uttered in Washington, London, Moscow or Paris. And we have an average of 435,000 constituents per district.

Certainly, I am having no trouble hearing from my good people because my mail is running, at the moment, 300 to 500 letters daily.

Today, we also have faster modes of transportation, such as the jet airplane.

Over the years, many Members have spoken out for a 4-year term. I could quote them, but I do not want to burden my colleagues. However, I would like to quote a few lines from a speech made in the U.S. Senate January 20, 1959, by my able friend, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD. Among other things he said:

I find that 170 years ago, there was no majority of opinion in favor of a 2-year term, and I feel that the supporting arguments for a 4-year term have advanced in this modern and more complex age.

He also said:

A 4-year term would give a Representative an opportunity to perform a greater service to his constituents, devoting more time to legislative duties.

In addition thereto, Senator MANSFIELD said:

Two years is by no means long enough for a Representative to learn his job, which is one of the most complicated, demanding, and responsible in the world.

Senator MANSFIELD completed this particular speech by saying:

Campaign and election costs have grown steadily and there is no reason to think they will decrease. Good men may be discouraged from running for the House of Representatives because they feel they cannot afford it. If a Member did not have to run every 2 years, the costs would certainly be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to learn that of the 46 present Members of the House who are undecided on this legislation at the moment, at least one-third of them stipulated that they would not only retain an open mind but were inclined to go along with some plan that would increase the present term from 2 to 4 years.

Inasmuch as this bill has to be submitted to the 50 State legislatures to be ratified—within 7 years—it will not therefore apply to me because frankly I do not plan to seek reelection for that length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that my bill will be forthwith referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House for hearings as soon as possible.

DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS PER ADVANCED DEGREES CONFERRED

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, measuring the research and development capabilities of educational institutions involves many factors, some general and others specific in nature. One of the general factors is the number of advanced degrees conferred. In this we must assume research and development activity is concentrated in the postgraduate schools. Further it is assumed the number of postgraduate degrees conferred provide an indication of the relative size of postgraduate facilities.

With this criteria of research and development capabilities established it is then possible to make an assessment of the geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds on the basis of dollars allocated to educational institutions per advanced degree conferred. The national average is \$14,300 per advanced degree.

Only nine States receive allocations on this basis which exceed the national average. Heading the list is Nevada with \$195,600 per advanced degree. At the bottom of the list is Wyoming with \$2,100.

Listed in 47th place is my own State of Indiana with \$3,400 per student. In the list of States which includes Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, only Illinois with \$16,900 per advanced degree exceeds the national average. The allocation to the other States include Minnesota, \$11,100; Iowa, \$10,900; Wisconsin, \$8,000; Ohio, \$7,000; Michigan, \$6,300, and as previously mentioned, Indiana, \$3,400.

Here is a solid, compact seven-State area which contains almost 25 percent of our Nation's population, which produces more than 25 percent of the advanced degrees conferred in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering. Its educational institutions have proven research and development capabilities and yet the geographical distribution of Government research and development funds indicates there is less than adequate utilization of these capabilities.

If this area of research and development competence continues to be overshadowed in the future on the basis of Federal research and development fund allocation then I fear it will become increasingly difficult to maintain this competence. And it should be pointed out this same apprehension can be expressed for most other sections of the Nation.

IN MEMORIAM

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item which appeared in the Gilmer Mirror, Gilmer, Tex., October 8, 1964, with reference to the death of Mr. O. J. Beckworth:

SERVICES HELD FOR O. J. BECKWORTH, 80

Otis Jefferson Beckworth, 80, father of Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH, died at 7:28 a.m., Friday following a lengthy illness at Gladewater Municipal Hospital.

Mr. Beckworth was a retired schoolteacher and had lived in east Texas many years, making his home in Gladewater for the past 12 years and he formerly resided in Gilmer.

Funeral services were held at First Baptist Church in Gladewater at 2 p.m. Monday with Rev. J. C. Henderson and Rev. Irby B. Bates officiating at rites. Interment was in Gilmer City Cemetery.

Mr. Beckworth was a member of the Baptist church many years, and was a native of Georgia. He came to Texas with his father and several brothers and sisters about 1890.

The family settled in Smith County, where Mr. Beckworth was reared and from whence he attended Sam Houston State Teachers College at Huntsville.

Mr. Beckworth returned to east Texas after completing his schooling and taught in numerous schools in Upshur County, which he made his home from that time until his death. He received a master of arts degree from Stephen F. Austin State College during the years and also served 6 years as county superintendent of schools in Upshur. He retired from public life while instructing at Winona schools.

Mr. Beckworth was married to the former Miss Josie Slaughter of Van Zandt County in 1912. She died in 1938. Four children were born to the Beckworths, including Congressman BECKWORTH and Mrs. Pat Smith, who are twins.

Mr. Beckworth married Mrs. Pearl Phipps in 1943 and they continued to reside in Upshur County until her death in August this year.

A member of Glade Creek Baptist Church, Mr. Beckworth also belonged to the Odd Fellows Lodge at Gilmer.

Surviving are his daughter, Mrs. Pat (Linzie) Smith, Gladewater; his son, a brother, E. M. Beckworth, Stephenville; a sister, Mrs. Julia Ranspot, Mineral Wells; and five grandchildren.

Fallbearers were Mr. Beckworth's nephews. They are Paul Beckworth and Gary Beckworth, of Dallas; Jake Slaughter, of Canton; L. F. Crawford, of Fruitvale; Cecil Bowdoin, and Russell Bowdoin, of Lindale; J. B. Beckworth, of Minden, La.; and Jake Beckworth, of Hope, Ark.

Also I desire to include a poem found in his Bible which was read during the funeral services:

FOR TODAY
(By Edgar Guest)

Lord, let me live today
From start to close,
In just the kindly way
Which friendship knows.
Let me be thoughtful, too,
And generous here;
Keeping in all I do
My record clear.

Lord, let me live today
Full to my best,
No hurtful thing I'd say
Even in jest.
Keep me from scorn and hate
And petty spite.
Lord, let my soul be great
From dawn to night.

Lord, let me live today
From malice free.
Let me in work or play
Unselfish be.
Let no one find me proud
Or harsh or cold,
Too silent, or too loud,
Afraid, or over bold.

Lord, let me live today
A friend to all
Who chance along my way
Though great or small;
And when at last the sun,
Now rising high, shall set,
Let there to all I've done
Be no regret.

Mr. Beckworth lived a full and fruitful life. He knew both the joy of living and the many sorrows that can come to a family. Two of his children, Otis Claxton and Nellie Mae Beckworth, died while he was a relatively young man, and his first wife was ill many years before she passed away in 1938. He knew success and also how to overcome handicapping obstacles and successive disappointments.

At the age of 20 he began to study the seventh grade and walked several miles each day—to and from the school he attended. After marrying Josie Slaughter, a well-known and beloved Texas teacher, he was taught by her and after two of his children were born, he continued his education, spending 2 years at Sam Houston Normal College. This enabled him to obtain a permanent State teachers certificate. He obtained a second permanent State teachers certificate by taking examinations on numerous subjects. When 52 years of age, he received his first degree at Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College; and when 59 years old, he received his master's degree at the same institution. He also attended the University of Texas. Mr. Beckworth was successful as a farmer, teacher, school administrator, and as county school superintendent. He and Mrs. Pearl Sloan Phipps Beckworth, his second wife, a prominent and well-loved Texas teacher who died but a few weeks before Mr. Beckworth, always participated actively in the political campaigns of his son, LINDLEY BECKWORTH. Widely known throughout Texas as an effective and diligent campaigner, he spoke convincingly in many towns and communities in behalf of his son, LINDLEY. He was always a faithful and active supporter of the Democratic Party and its nominees.

With the passing of Mr. Beckworth, it can be said that a person who counted for good and who was a truly constructive personality had died. In his many years as a teacher and administrator, he championed the cause of the needy child. Mr. Beckworth was well known as a friend to the downtrodden and forgotten. He and his good wife, Miss Pearl, would carry food and fresh vegetables to impoverished people. He was always active in behalf of the worthy causes of his Nation, his State, and the communities in which he lived. Never was he afraid of an unpopular cause if he believed it right and just, nor would he dodge an uncomfortable decision. Otis Jefferson Beckworth was—above all—loyal and

faithful to his family, his religion, his friends, and his country.

USE OF CHEMICAL WARFARE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to learn that the United States is using chemical warfare in South Vietnam. According to newspaper reports today, the United States has given, and is giving, the South Vietnamese disabling "types of tear gas" for combat use. This is the first time the United States has been involved in the combat use of gas since World War I.

It has long been recognized that chemical and biological warfare is inhumane and should not be used in combat. In August 1943, at the height of World War II, President Roosevelt speaking about the use of gas in combat stated:

Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

On January 13, 1960, President Eisenhower, in speaking of chemical and biological weapons, stated:

So far as my instinct is concerned, it is to not start such a thing as that first.

Now the United States has started first. The use of gas, like napalm bombing, is an inhumane measure in a desperate war.

According to the newspaper accounts, gas was first used in December. The people of this Nation and their representatives were never told of this new departure. Who knows what to expect next.

I have several times spoken before this House and urged that an honorable settlement be negotiated in Vietnam. Several of my colleagues have suggested the same course of action. As long as it is believed this complex issue can be resolved by military might, there will be an increasing temptation to escalate the war.

The time has come to seek a diplomatic settlement in Vietnam.